A PLAN S FOR BOOKS?

VOICES
FROM THE OPEN ACCESS BOOKS COMMUNITY
SESSIONS SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The [Open Access Books Network](#) (OABN) is a forum that brings together researchers, publishers, librarians, infrastructure providers and other actors from across the world to share knowledge, support and best practice about issues related to open access books. The network was established and is facilitated by OAPEN, OPERAS, ScholarLed and SPARC Europe. Beginning in late 2020 and continuing in 2021, the organisations came together to explore how to best inform and help cOAlition S with its plans for OA books:

> *"cOAlition S will, by the end of 2021, issue a statement on Plan S principles as they apply to monographs and book chapters, together with related implementation guidance."*

The OABN was seen as a very suitable vehicle to bring a range of voices belonging to the OA book community together to discuss the key elements of an OA book policy, without framing it as an official consultation. The network did so by putting together a series of online workshops, named "Voices from the OA Books Community". This kind of community activity around an international OA book policy was a first of its kind.

The series was initiated at the OPERAS conference in November 2020, with a session on funding and business models. The following five workshops focused on five key themes: policy scope, quality assurance, green OA, discoverability and metadata, rights retention and licensing, and OA business models. The series gathered around 450 different stakeholders -- publishers, funders, OA policy makers, researchers, librarians, and infrastructure providers - from Europe to the US to Latin America, to listen to invited speakers and take part in intensive, small-group discussions about the issues raised. All shared the common understanding that this mixed community has an important role to play in shaping a policy for OA books. These sessions were recorded and noted, and the outputs shared with the whole community via the OABN's website.

Over the span of eight weeks, SPARC Europe worked rigorously on a document that seeks to reflect the many and diverse voices as accurately as possible whilst organising and summarising the main areas of agreement or contention. The results of this effort are contained in this document. Our high-level takeaways are:

1. There was consensus that publicly funded, scholarly and peer-reviewed long-form publications such as monographs, chapters and edited volumes should be within the scope of a Plan S for books.
2. Opinions differ as regards the formats of publications to include in any policy scope, required quality of self-archived content, metadata, and preferred types of licenses for OA books.
3. There is considerable diversity in the OA books community when national, regional and disciplinary backgrounds are considered, these include culture, language (multilingualism),

quality assurance standards, transparency, publishing tradition and markets also referred to as bibliodiversity.

4. Engaging with the community at the outset of policy development will pave the way to more sustainable solutions and a policy that more stakeholders can embrace and realise.
5. The Open Access Books Network (OABN) has proven to be an efficient and trusted forum for bringing OA stakeholders together to discuss OA book policy.
6. There is great value in building on these discussions with the community and cOAlition S to decide upon common priorities and to flesh out the implementation process of a Plan S for books.

The voices in this document reflect the many thoughts and questions raised by the session participants around a number of critical areas. Since the nature of the sessions saw such a wide range of opinions, further consensus-building activities would be necessary to formulate recommendations or conclusions. We are convinced that this approach will better ensure a more sustainable funding landscape for OA books. We are keen to help foster a robust and healthy policy process and implementation plan for OA books and propose exploring this together with cOAlition S.

The OA Books Network supported by SPARC Europe, OAPEN, OPERAS and ScholarLed

METHODOLOGY

The Voices from the OA Books Community series comprised six workshops focussing on different aspects of policy for Open Access books. It was initiated at the OPERAS conference, which was held digitally in November 2020. This pilot session included expert talks, followed by a workshop session, in which participants were asked to set down their thoughts on funding models for OA books.

A further five standalone workshops were organised, and each focussed on specific themes: policy scope, quality assurance, Green OA, metadata and rights retention and licensing. The first part of each session was devoted to an expert panel discussion, which was recorded. In the second part, participants were invited into virtual breakout rooms for further discussion. Each breakout room had a notepad, where participants were invited to take notes, recording the main points of their discussions. After each session, notepads remained open for two weeks, so that the community could add any further comments.

SPARC Europe worked on summarizing the voices heard in each session, based on the automated transcripts of experts' talks, and notes from the six sessions. In this process, our priority was to record all the voices as truthfully as possible. While they are organized according to main themes and synthesised, no further additions were made after the session to be true to the sessions. The notes were subsequently reviewed by the session leaders.

The views and opinions expressed in these sessions are the personal views and opinions of the speaker(s) and do not necessarily represent or reflect the views or opinions of the OABN and its supporting organizations.

All recordings and notes are publicly available on the OABN site.
Notes and automatic sessions transcripts
Recordings:
Session 1: Policy scope
Session 2: Quality Assurance and transparency
Session 3: Green OA for books
Session 4:Discovery and metadata
Session 5: Rights retention and licensing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SESSION 0

FUNDING

SESSION 0: FUNDING

Introduction

Monographs already often require subsidies, which could be extended to support OA. However, there is currently a lack of funding for OA books and doubts were expressed as to whether sufficient funding was in the system to fund SSH research outputs and/or monographs. Also, to what extent does cOAlition S represent enough SSH funders for a policy to be effective for the entire SSH sector? This is particularly relevant if funders decide what to fund. That funding also depends on national and disciplinary contexts. It can be unevenly distributed. For example, small countries with few commercial publishers and publishing in national languages are a problem.

An attendee proposed that a Plan S for books should: "Align to Plan S principles •Support full Open Access publishing and transition towards it (so, purely oa publishers and 'traditional publishers' seeking to transition) •Address the particularities of monograph/book writing and publishing/existing business models and good practices •Support a healthy and diverse scholarly book publishing environment that is sustainable for funders and institutions in the long-term •Have long-lasting effects in funder and institutional practices and the way books are funded (short-term funding and long-term funding and investments)." The challenge of funding the operations of OA book publishing platforms or infrastructure was also raised.

However, it was also recommended that a Plan S for books should take caution around BPCs and should fund systemic transformation. It should promote multiple models, fund born-OA presses, and transitioned presses, and provide ongoing stability for them. It should eliminate author-facing charges where possible. A number of models were discussed.

Funding schemes/business models

It is important to find viable business models as there seems to be some uncertainty over continuing print and print sales in the OA world. Large publishers also have different business models to smaller publishers and differences in models exist across countries and cultures. Furthermore, some universities publish ebooks and obtain revenues from them. Trade publishers are probably not willing to give up revenues. One attendee felt that university presses are uniquely placed to support a transition to OA monographs although another made a point that some US university presses are expected to return revenues back to the institution, which is true for countries such as the US and UK for example.

A number of models were proposed, including the BPC, transformative models helping publishers transition to OA, or sustained support for collaborative/institutional/collective models. It is also difficult to come up with appropriate funding schemes for chapters since different authors may have access to different grants from different funding agencies. It was noted that in the interests of

academic quality/promotion/funding, some authors feel bound to the business model of a particular publisher.

For a diverse landscape of OA books to flourish, there needs to be a more nuanced understanding of funding and potential funding approaches rather than just focusing on the BPC-model, which may only cater to the needs of a few publishers. Systemic change will need to be supported, as will the long-term sustainability of university presses. So a mixed model approach will be necessary.

There was a debate around the BPC. It was noted that the diversity of book types and costs associated with them presents a challenge to formulate adequate Book Processing Charges. For many, the BPC could not be the only model, nor a primary one as it doesn't have a transformative effect. This model was considered the least scalable by some. Also, aside from a few funders and well-funded institutions it was unclear as to how BPCs could be funded.

Libraries are starting to fill the funding gap. It was stated that some libraries are interested in non-BPC models such as collective funding for books. A collective funding system could be a one-stop shop for funding, publishing and educating authors: connecting libraries, funders and publishers. It should be simple, transparent and take regional needs into account. It was suggested that a model that builds on the existing subscription budgets of libraries such as the Opening the Future model could be advisable especially in terms of scalability. Here, backlists could also be made OA at a future date if enough institutions participate in the long term. The topic of transformative agreements for books was also raised. Here, funders could set a goal, which publishers could strive towards. Currently some publishers operate with only a 10% profit margin. This type of transformative model could eventually become scaleable.

Discussion arose around what a funding scheme for OA books might look like. For example, OA books could be funded by coalitions of research funders and institutions going forward. One could fund a package of 10/20/30 books, a series, a publishing project rather than individual books. This could allow publishers to make a more meaningful estimation of the costs and these schemes could fund more than one publisher. Financial models also need to reflect editorial costs and the quality of publication. It was mentioned that blanket funding for an institution may not work in all cases since many authors are either independent scholars or loosely affiliated with their institutions. These authors are often not eligible for institutional publishing funds. It was also pointed out that ECRs might not have access to funds, and yet need to publish.

SESSION 1

POLICY SCOPE

SESSION 1: POLICY SCOPE

General considerations

It is clear that the current Plan S guidelines for journals as they are cannot be applied to books for a number of reasons. The book publishing sector is very diverse and defining what types of long-form research should fall under the scope of an OA policy is therefore challenging. A policy needs to address both progressive and conservative authors where possible although it is recognised that it will be impossible to satisfy all needs.

Differences also exist between countries related to book markets, the culture and traditions of publishing, disciplines, definitions of peer-review, focus on bibliodiversity, language, types of publishing, differences in formats, funding mechanisms, and the extent of subsidised funding. Attendees reported that, in at least five countries, independent academic publishers are not willing to engage fully with OA, preferring more restricted versions of accessing content, such as free-to-access. An attendee from one country reported that local language publishing is in decline since English is perceived as necessary for university funding and collaboration. This shows the diversity in publishers particularly when looking at OA books by country, but also the fragility of parts of these ecosystems. There is also a large gap between small, medium and large publishers since their goals can also be different, e.g. publishing on topics of particular national interest in different languages. This is where an inclusive policy can help alignment for OA books.

It is also important that funder requirements respect the objectives/requirements of the discipline and/or scholarship. Addressing a country's subsidy system when considering funding OA is essential.

The policy must be framed by a clear argument about why OA for books is important. It should define the end goal, but leave flexibility for how the end goal is achieved. It was suggested that it would be important to define when the policy comes into force to allow for transition, e.g. to make all book contracts from year X OA. The policy also needs to provide guidelines for its implementation, to include monitoring and compliance checking, and to be reactive to future challenges. The policy needs to primarily speak to scholarly standards rather than government or commerce priorities.

A policy needs to be relevant for a range of disciplines, and not be based solely on what works in STEM. Some participants felt that a Plan S for books should be HSS-centered, taking into consideration the HSS different publishing timeline; underfunded disciplines; more fragile – even disappearing – disciplines; more diversity of publishing; less standardization in methods, styles, and practices; as well as the lack of a standardized international research assessment system.

It was advised that, initially, recommendations rather than requirements should be made, in order to enable a transition to OA amongst a broad range of stakeholders such as publishers, funders and libraries. It was pointed out that there is a fluid boundary between academic and non-academic books, which makes it difficult to formulate a strict policy to cover all publications. Academic books are often published by universities and scientific societies. A global proposal for Open Access academic books, which concentrates on quality, being transparent about the process of peer review, and licensing, would be advisable.

Furthermore, it was raised that it was vital to support infrastructures that underpin not-for-profit or diamond OA book publishing.

Some attendees were more hesitant about an OA book policy, and of the opinion that a Plan S policy for OA books that was too restrictive may impinge on academic freedom. Another voice was concerned that a mandate would "make Amazon richer on the backs of publishers and authors." A further voice suggested that a critical mass of OA books needs to be created first.

Scope and definitions
There was consensus that Open Access to books is important, although opinions on how, to what extent, and for whom, differed.

A broader but more precise definition of what is meant by "book", to include more innovative forms such as multimedia, was felt to be important, particularly as the divisions between book types are more arbitrary in the digital world. This is also important for the sake of bibliodiversity: books are not straightforwardly similar in extent, format, in how they incorporate third-party material, and more. A policy needs to be future-fit to be able to address new technologies and ways of researching that are being pioneered in fields such as the Digital Humanities, for example. Participants were unsure as to whether digital/interactive elements that may be linked to from the book are in scope for a policy on OA books.

Long-form publication was welcomed by some as a more all-encompassing term: Long-form content can be used in different settings and repurposed, i.e. for research or education.

The policy needs to address social aspects such as bibliodiversity and inclusivity, through multilingualism for example, which boosts access to books. We have to contend with the fact that most of the language of metadata is English, including tags. So when we want to preserve bibliodiversity, the issue of language should be thoroughly addressed.

There was some disagreement around the purpose of Open Access for books. A majority of attendees agreed that academic output should be made open if publicly funded, although perhaps only primary research --and there was some discussion about whether public or private funding could be easily separated in practice. Some thought that Open Access should apply only to more accessible books or topics, which would be more likely to appeal to a broader public audience, while access to specialised works that are of narrower societal interest should remain limited. Others felt that it was important for books to be made OA for an academic audience, not solely a public one. The policy should make clear whether the funders' goal is to increase access to its academic research for academic purposes, or whether, for example, they want to influence public thinking (or both).

Some attendees proposed that books that have been peer-reviewed should be included in the scope of a Plan S for books. It was also stressed that the peer-review processes should be made transparent by publishers, and a DOAB certification service regarding peer-review definition was mentioned as a potential point of reference.

Types of publications to include in scope
There was consensus that monographs, edited volumes and chapters should be in scope for an OA book policy. It was pointed out that in the case of the UK, based on the UKRI consultation, it is clear which types of publications are in and out of scope and these categories should be considered by Plan S. It should also be pointed out that there might be countries with specific requirements for academic assessment that might mandate some form of OA for books. cOAlition S should be mindful of these developing policies in different countries. It is therefore important to also recognize differences between disciplines, acknowledge bibliodiversity and regional definitions of peer review, and leave it to the individual funder to make the final call about what should count as an in-scope publication.

Innovative formats were also raised as an important type of output for books overall. For example, the Digital Humanities sector is undertaking strong work here: funding such open efforts would be advisable. It was also noted that with innovative formats, preservation issues will arise.
Other categories of research output which could be in scope (with no consensus), include:
Audio/visual content, conference proceedings, critical editions, critical translations, datasets, handbooks, reference works, and research data.

Concerns about certain publication types:

Monograph
Several participants were concerned that it might be challenging for the research funder to cover the costs of publishing an OA monograph when the completion of the monograph occurs after the end of the project.

Trade books
There was great uncertainty about whether trade books should be in scope for OA. There is a lack of a clear definition of what a trade book is and the difference between it and the monograph. It is not clear whether trade books are generated from research funds, and thus to be made OA. However, if they are generated by public money, should they not be made OA? "Do funders want to influence public thinking (as in trade) or is the objective to get research they have funded out?" Trade books can be a revenue source for some publishers (and authors) since the market is larger as compared to the monograph, with less of a focus on original research. It is not clear what to do with crossover books.

Textbooks
There was no consensus on textbooks. Some felt that textbooks fall out of scope because they do not often focus on original research and are less likely to be publicly funded (as with trade books). It was, however, noted that there has been a wave of recent OER/textbook funding opportunities and announcements, particularly in the North American sphere, in California. There were also sometimes blurry lines between "monograph" pricing tiers and "textbook" pricing tiers.

It was questioned as to whether textbooks published by commercial publishers and universities should be treated in the same way. The question was also raised as to who should pay for the investment made in textbooks. Furthermore, some authors get royalties for their textbooks, which OA might threaten. However, it was stated that if textbooks are not included in Plan S, publishers will offset monograph costs by putting up textbook prices. If textbooks are the result of a teaching process, it was argued that perhaps they should follow OER goals and models.

PhD dissertations
The dissertation is the all-important first publication for the ECR. There are different regional OA practices with PhD dissertations which need to be taken into consideration, e.g. some countries or institutions mandate dissertation self-archiving. Some argue that dissertations are not always peer-reviewed so perhaps they are not in scope, whereas others consider that they should be since they are an accepted form of research output. Dissertations may not need external financial support to be made OA. The relationship of the dissertation or thesis and the book is complicated since some report that dissertations are different to the final book version and could be seen as pre-prints, whereas others disagree.

Conference proceedings
It is unclear as to whether conference proceedings should be in scope depending on whether they are reviewed, edited or a sound research output.

Exceptions
There were few exceptions tabled:
Books with a lot of third-party permissions material, e.g., in art and design were mentioned in one breakout room as an exception due to complexities with rights management. If they were made OA with not all material shared, this could result in OA books with no or little third-party material. Until the GLAM sector has made more of its archives OA, this will be a problem.
On the other hand, if too many exceptions are made, it is often more difficult to put standardised processes in place, so a clear scope would be preferable.

Discipline differences
It was argued that mandates need to focus less on format, and more on discipline since they influence how researchers are pushed to publish and in what format. There is no one size that fits all. HSS has less funds available to publish than STEM. The way that research is conducted in the Humanities for example is different.
It was suggested that it was important to recognize the complexity of discipline-related differences and leave it to individual funders to make final decisions about what should count as an in-scope publication.

Infrastructure
It was pointed out that supporting infrastructures and networks for non-BPC-funded OA books is necessary to sustain diversity in authorship and publishers.

Advocacy
Participants pointed out that support is needed for advocacy and training. A need for community-developed standards was also mentioned, with examples given such as the OAPEN OA books toolkit or the new JISC university press toolkit.

Differences between journals and books
A few noted differences in approach when it comes to formulating a Plan S for books as opposed to journals. It was pointed out that the book publishing landscape is more diverse than that of journals, and that policymakers should be mindful of its diversity so as not to potentially damage the sector by following a policy that works for journals but not for books. Books can, for example, be both sold in hard copies and made OA.

We should not prioritise scale to benefit large-scale commercially-driven publishers, since the book publishing landscape is diverse and innovation is often driven by smaller publishers with limited resources. There was a voice calling attention to a distinct tradition in book publishing and the role that professional acquisition editors play in it. It was noted that for some publishers the work of acquisition editors really contributes to the health of the discipline, and they might also account for a large percentage of the costs of producing a book.

Unintended consequences
Participants of the session listed several concerns about unintended consequences of a Plan S for books. There were voices calling for special diligence when creating such a plan, as it will affect the wider scholarly communications ecosystem. Among concerns we heard voices pointing to the potential danger of deepening inequality: it was pointed out that Plan S is seen as an initiative geared towards research-intensive HEIs, which tend to win larger funding bids. In this context, less research-oriented institutions might get excluded from any support, creating inequity. Another voice warned of the risk of creating an overly uniform policy that does not function in all regions and favours certain types of publishing. Policy should not be built on a strongly European industry that provides employment to many and contributes taxes. A few voiced concerns that a Plan S for books might unintentionally promote BPC-based models, which are unsustainable and would result in further exclusion of less research-intensive institutions. Funds should not necessarily be put into the hands of mainstream publishers but rather into university presses or smaller publishers.

SESSION 2

QUALITY ASSURANCE
AND TRANSPARENCY

SESSION 2: QUALITY ASSURANCE AND TRANSPARENCY

Introduction
Quality assurance is fundamental to book publishing: research should be peer-reviewed by impartial peer-reviewers. It is also worthwhile to think about the other steps in the OA book production process, as well as peer review. Are there successful formulas that improve quality in these areas, and can we base policies on these?

It is vital that we ask stakeholders about their quality needs. The importance of good editorial practices was mentioned, such as COPE. It was suggested that while it is important to have a minimum standard of aspects that must be adhered to, that we reward best practices and demonstrate them to the community.

A poll asked "Which standards (editorial/technical) should be prioritized for quality assurance and transparency?" 96% indicated transparency of peer-review procedures as the most important. Open licensing came in second and third were persistent identifiers.

It is important to avoid predatory book publishing, which could be caused by having the BPC as a dominant business model. Funder requirements need to be aligned with the objectives and requirements of scholarship and should not define the latter. Funders may also have different objectives, like gaining societal impact.

Peer review
A minimum quality standard was proposed: that the full manuscript is peer-reviewed as well as the proposal. Transparency of the peer-review process was considered important to evaluate the quality of the book. How this is communicated is key, e.g. from the vague 'we have rigorous peer-review processes' to the specific 'we send at least two chapters and a book proposal for peer review by two independent experts' to 'we send a full MS for independent peer review'. Publishers might also go one step further by anonymously publishing the actual peer reviews. Several supported the idea that a policy could require publishers to publish details of their peer-review policy on their website in order to receive funding; these could then be monitored. This transparency could be a condition set by the funder and/or for funding the OA book.
One important thing to take into account is that it can be challenging to find peer reviewers for longform publications.

What should/could funders do to guarantee quality control and transparency?

Funders might call for a basic metadata threshold and could set technical standards when funding book publishing programmes.

The following points of reference need to be taken into consideration when developing a policy on quality control and transparency: the OAPEN-DOAB certification program, the European Science Foundation's research integrity guidelines, DOAJ for journals and DOAB, OASPA and its checklist for journals and OA book publishers, and best practices for metadata and identifiers. An Open Book Watch could suggest certain standards. See also the notes from our session on Discoverability and Metadata.

Career assessment, tenure and promotion

The role of books in career assessment was discussed in several contexts. Participants stressed that OA book policies need to relate to career assessment and evaluation systems/protocols. In some regions, like Latin America, books are not even included in research assessment procedures. The important role of monographs and edited volumes in advancing researchers' careers was noted, especially in HSS.

Where you publish influences the tenure and promotion process. Established publishing brands can distort promotion and tenure; quality and prestige can get conflated. New brands can be negatively affected by this system. An attendee raised the point that perhaps the fact that a book is OA might weigh more than where it is published.

Funders and universities can explore other research evaluation mechanisms that go beyond the IF in journals or publisher prestige or brand with books, such as considering the experience of the researcher, although this will negatively impact the early career researcher. Publications that have shown their continued value over time could also be considered prestigious and be considered in research assessment, for example.

Larger publishers with more resources and infrastructure are more able to comply with policy requirements than smaller, more diverse ones, and will thereby be more likely to maintain their prestige.

It was suggested that if DOIs were minted to various scholarly outputs, these could be more easily cited, and that data could be used in the tenure/promotion process. It was noted that citation requirements might exacerbate existing inequities.

Cost transparency

It was suggested that there should be transparency regarding the costs of publishing OA books, especially when published under the BPC model. It was considered important to ask publishers to be clear on how they operate, what their business models and publishing costs are. This should be published on the publisher website to inform authors. Many publishers can face challenges in tracking the costs of books on a title level, however, e.g. indirect costs and overheads. Some libraries or university presses also have difficulties in tracking these costs, including in-kind contributions. It is unclear what level of granularity is needed in cost transparency.

Participants pointed out that costly services should be identified and possible reductions thought of. It was also noted that libraries had limited funding for OA books. One respondent pointed out that the cost per book diminishes for libraries when OA books are funded through collective funding models.

Costs can also differ by book based on the state of readiness for publication or on what services are needed to complete publication. So in practice, books are likely to have different costs, but if a funder sets a fixed fund per book, or cap, then a publisher might charge that sum to make the collection sustainable, regardless of the actual costs. Could perhaps the journal approach of assigning percentages of the price to different service buckets, work for books? Furthermore, confidentiality clauses might make transparency difficult, or, for commercial

publishers, revealing too much information about costs could break competition/antitrust law. Legal advice would be needed to determine what information can indeed be shared in such cases.

The role of infrastructures

Different publishers have differing resources available to them. Meeting standards is challenging and support is needed to do so. Infrastructures can support quality standards and encourage others to implement them.

Support is needed for OA book infrastructure. Areas mentioned, which facilitate quality assurance but are in need of concrete support, include community-based infrastructure like DOAB or Crossref, or acquiring DOIs. Infrastructure should ideally be joined up and international. How can infrastructures support funders? Articulating that would be important. An issue was raised that it is hard to get funding for infrastructure from libraries at present.

High-quality metadata

It is also essential that we have high-quality metadata that reflects a range of output types and aspects of Open Access, like licensing information.

When setting metadata requirements, one should be aware of existing requirements such as those of the DOAB and OASPA. It was also noted that metadata on publisher peer-review practice and ethics is not widely available.

SESSION 3

GREEN OA FOR BOOKS

SESSION 3: GREEN OA FOR BOOKS

General

It is important to define the goals of OA, and specifically of Green OA, as well as defining precisely what is meant by Green or self-archiving. Some mythbusting around quality issues for example is necessary to mitigate concerns around self-archiving.

Participants expressed a range of motivations for self-archiving, including increasing access to scholarly work for all those who might benefit, seeking to improve on how we communicate and re-use research, and to apply a more equitable scholarly communications model. Self archiving or Green OA for books also enables researchers to easily check if books are of direct value. Green OA could be particularly useful for chapters in edited collections in the case that the entire volume is not self-archivable; or for the open dissemination of PhD dissertations or theses.
However, it is not yet standard practice to self-archive OA books, unlike articles, due to some of the issues mentioned below.

It was suggested that Plan S asks for more clarity on the policies of book publishers that relate to rights management and self-archiving, since Green policies can be lacking or unclear - even from larger publishers. An attendee suggested that the EC Horizon Europe policy could be applied where deposit in a trusted repository is mandatory. It was pointed out that if funders allow a Green OA route to compliance, funders should clearly stipulate what should be involved in order to provide author guidelines and to manage author expectations.

A few voices named certain adverse consequences of Green OA, e.g. that self-archiving might restrict the author's publishing choices by putting off potential publishers, or that self-archiving it might reduce library interest in purchasing the final published version. There were a number of community concerns around self-archiving. The possible impact of self-archiving on publishers or authors is described below.

Differing contexts

Differences between books and journals
Participants identified a range of differences between books and journals, including that books are generally more expensive to produce, resulting in the cost of a monograph being unaffordable for most scholars so the demand for OA books is higher. Another topic raised was that the total spent on books is much less than for journals.
Books are produced in a wider range of formats and languages.
Journals are often about reporting findings whereas the monograph is a fundamental part of how research in some disciplines is conducted.

Differences between disciplines
The type of content shared in books differs by discipline, as with some humanities subjects like Art History that may share more third-party content. This can make self-archiving difficult.

Funding
Monograph publishing is fragile in terms of economics, particularly since high costs are often associated with publishing a book and some publishers need to make money on their publications. Self-archiving may not be the answer to the cost of OA book publishing. Might resources spent on Green be better invested in supporting Gold OA?
One should still note, however, that the amount spent on books is much lower than on journals. More business models generally need to be explored for OA books.

Viability
Green was thought to be a solution, but not always the ideal one. The viability of Green was put into question as compared to Gold. Impact studies are lacking on how widely self-archived material is used by readers. However, concerns were expressed that were Green not to be compliant with a Plan S policy for books, that this would negatively impact less well-funded regions of the world. Self-archiving also allows OA for those with low financial means. The long-term accessibility and preservation of self-archived research output is important when considering Green OA's viability.

Possible impacts on publishers
Publishers shared concerns around how self-archiving might negatively impact on sales. While some stated that evidence exists showing that OA can boost print sales and expose material to more readers, others claimed that such evidence was lacking. Two stated that publishers needed to rethink about the added value they bring, e.g. their essential services, and look at lowering costs.

Possible impacts on authors
Concerns were raised around author fears about having to give up royalties from print sales if their work was published via a Green OA route (which could also apply to Gold). The process of self-archiving would also need to be made clear, including whether to share earlier versions than the final one, or how to create PDF versions of a book without it being too burdensome. However, it was also pointed out that libraries are well equipped to support authors in self-archiving. Another voice expressed worries about the risks of self-archiving a PhD thesis, which may jeopardize future publication if publishers are wary about publishing a book based on an openly available thesis.

Self-archiving vs Gold OA
Some expressed doubts about the effectiveness of Green OA for books, since it may not encourage a transition to Gold. It may even disincentivise Gold, and may not be cost effective. It could also negatively impact existing OA book publishers.

Quality OA content
Most discussions revolved around concerns about the quality of material shared through self-archiving, with discussions on the two versions, VOR and AAM, the most prominent.
Concerns were expressed about which version should be made OA, including that the type of version (AAM or VoR) needs to be clearly specified, making clear under which terms and licence it is to be released. The VoR is the final, stamped, peer-reviewed version and contains figures/tables/embedded audio-visual material, restructured content, indexes or appendices, etc and is thus preferable. Failing the VoR, the AAM would be the preferred version for self-archiving as it is the last author version after copy-editing and peer review. However, since the editorial and production processes for a book are typically far more comprehensive than for an article, the

qualitative difference between the VoR and the AAM (just after peer review) will normally be significant. Therefore, special attention needs to be given to the version for self-archiving. Furthermore, general concerns were expressed around the quality of the AAM with some seeing any version as inferior. One participant responded by saying that the policy should focus on the goal of OA: stating that any OA version is better than none.

Managing, linking and citing certain or multiple versions was also expressed as a concern since current practice is to cite the VoR. One respondent asked whether having an Open Access and a closed version of the book might be ideal.

Embargoes
It was reported that, after a long consultation process, the EC saw no reason to embargo work in any discipline. However, another participant was concerned that self-archiving the AAM with no embargo may disincentivize purchasing the Version of Record so embargoes may therefore need to be considered.

Accessibility
Technical and financial barriers exist for OA books. Some concerns were expressed about the discoverability of self-archived material. Making self-archived books FAIR could make them more findable, accessible, and reusable.

Optimising the self-archiving process
One participant suggested that publishers could provide the version that could be made available to open repositories. However, they would need to be given resources to do this so as not to prejudice publishers against accepting authors funded by cOAlition S. Infrastructures could also support institutions with version management although it was also observed that infrastructures are on the increase, which might make the process more complex. Clear guidance would be needed on this point in order to make sure that policy stipulations can realistically be implemented.

Pre-prints
Authors could consider publishing pre-prints of their books without embargoes, e.g. like dissertations, although this concept was not clear to all. It was not clear as to whether this would be considered as an inferior offering.

SESSION 4

DISCOVERABILITY AND METADATA

SESSION 4: DISCOVERABILITY AND METADATA

Introduction
There was agreement that metadata for OA books is a challenging area. This is not just an issue for OA book publishers but affects other publishers as well. Differences in the understanding of metadata are quite evident across communities in the scholarly ecosystem, so the context is important when defining metadata recommendations and more guidance is needed. The global research community needs to address this, but it is also important for any policy mandating the publication of OA books to take it into account. Although these challenges are often perceived as technical ones, at heart they are political issues that need to be addressed as such. It was also noted that not all funders understand OA book publishing well. Although Plan S provides detailed requirements for journal metadata, these are not directly transferable to OA books for a number of reasons, as shown below. Neither are OA book publishers at the same stage as OA journal publishers in terms of their ability to fulfil technical requirements.

The quality of metadata
Discussion arose around what high-quality metadata is. Views differed, ranging from calling for a minimum viable record properly defined for a disciplinary focus, maybe with a scale of relevance (high-medium-low), to the idea that it would be better to compromise by offering general guidelines. It was noted that there is little guidance or common understanding of what high quality metadata is. When needing to be able to track the output and impact of OA books through metadata, for example in order to assess and report on policy impact, this is problematic. Furthermore, it was asked how we should deal with the metadata of back catalogues.

Schemas and formats
In books, there are so many different types of metadata formats, subject codes, structures and requirements, e.g. Thema, MARC, ONIX. This is problematic as this makes finding both the metadata and OA books difficult. Some standards are outdated for the digital age and there is no consistency of metadata standards around books. Duplicate DOIs can also exist on different platforms. Metadata needs to identify one unique book or object. It is important to differentiate clearly what we describe with the metadata: content, abstracts, media, format, etc. and to avoid a mixture of different types of metadata. This could also include accessibility requirements. For books, the systems are not necessarily in place yet for data on citations so they should be recommended rather than required. Chapters are a growing content type; they need to be discoverable. However, DOIs and other metadata for individual chapters are problematic.

Furthermore, there are a range of services that require specific metadata standards, such as repositories, Zenodo, OpenAIRE, and Crossref. To what extent is global compliance with certain service metadata standards like OpenAIRE achievable for all publishers and/or organisations? This is something that should be established before a policy mandate is set. It was noted that some metadata collections are not made open. An optimal set of metadata for OA books, which is open and community-owned, could be more advisable such as COPIM's Thoth. National libraries generate metadata and are important for maintaining standards. However, there is variation from country to country. National statistical providers and W3C and its Publishing Working Group are also important actors.

There are a range of formats for the supply chain and for libraries, which need their own metadata formats. They have unique requirements (that are fit for purpose) and also overlapping ones (how can we easily map ONIX to MARC). Book publishers spend a lot of time on metadata but their investment is in ISBN and ONIX. Smaller publishers in particular have limited resources to invest in metadata management and this should be borne in mind in any policy recommendations (this also relates to the need to preserve bibliodiversity and not to create policies that small publishers cannot abide by). Interoperability between standards and formats should be prioritized. There are tools that can support some of this, such as https://annif.org/.

Persistent identifiers (PIDs)
The community considers PIDs as important, e.g. ORCID or DOIs. PID databases are also important; ideally the standards are open and PIDs are free, community-owned and managed. However, there is a monetary barrier to PIDs for both smaller publishers and in certain regions of the world.

Much of the software used in book production does not facilitate the usage of PIDs. Furthermore, DOIs are not widely used in many humanities subjects, which means that there is a danger that books, one of the main avenues of humanities scholarship, are going to be left out of the landscape.

The metadata attached to the PID is what is important in order to make the output visible or interoperable. There are a few issues with PIDs. While CrossRef and DataCite are considered the "standard" databases and have APIs, other services exist, for example, in China, which means that content could be missed if these DOIs are not processed. Many authors are not updating their ORCIDs appropriately, i.e. with affiliations. Manual systems may result in the wrong author being identified. Some countries, such as Finland, are about to publish guidelines on PIDs. There is a need for training for both authors and publishers.

Technical infrastructure
It was considered that the current infrastructure is not fit for purpose for books or chapters since it focuses on the journal workflow or on the printed book. It was mentioned that the metadata systems in place for books are set up for booksellers (trade books) rather than for OA scholarly publications. SciELO has a database with chapter-level metadata but so far no database has received this data. Competition from open source tools or Consonance could help. It was suggested that the DOAB might be moving towards indexing chapters.

If metadata requirements are made mandatory, the very long tail of book publishers may not be able to provide a large amount of metadata unless requirements are minimal. We need tools for smaller publishers to avoid rekeying data many times. It would be helpful to create a metadata system that would be free for publishers, easy to use and that could export various metadata formats to various service providers. For example Thoth (https://thoth.pub/), an open metadata dissemination system currently in development as part of COPIM, a Research England (UKRI) and

Arcadia-funded project, or [ScienceOpen's OA Book Metadata Project](#) funded by the [German Federal Ministry of Education and Research](#).

In order to implement the technical infrastructure effectively, developers need to be part of the conversation to understand the technical specifications for the varying types of output and how the specs may need to be changed in order to add the appropriate data.

Publishers
Publishers try to meet funder requirements as best they can. However, they are often dependent on authors to provide high-quality metadata. Many publishers are primarily print publishers, even in the US as well as countries such as Greece or Spain. Book publishers are having to provide an extra level of identification management in addition to e-identifiers.

An OA book policy needs to consider barriers for entry for small publishers, ie. whether they can comply and afford the transition. It was suggested that time is needed for smaller publishers to be able to implement requirements. For example, start with recommendations or a "best practices" phase before moving into "requirements". Platforms such as [OAPEN](#) could help publishers who do not have the skills or resources to develop the technical infrastructure needed to format and display the metadata in alignment with the funder requirements.

Discovery
It was noted that some publishers might not be making OA books discoverable, either intentionally or unintentionally due to minimum standards not being in place. This saw some discussion.
Hopefully Plan S will promote more OA publishing and help discoverability.
It was noted that Google Books, Google Scholar, Amazon and social media are mechanisms to provide access to OA books, and these discovery services differ from one another.
Preservation of metadata was discussed and it was noted that archiving of metadata is encouraged but not required by Crossref. It was asked whether DOIs should resolve to the place of preservation or to the publisher site for discovery.

SESSION 5

RIGHTS RETENTION AND LICENSING

SESSION 5: RIGHTS RETENTION AND LICENSING

Introduction

Rights retention and open licensing can support authors to publish anywhere. However, managing and understanding differing copyright and licensing policies from a wide range of jurisdictions and publishers is difficult for authors, information managers and policymakers. There are very few policy statements that work in all places at all times, for all things. What we need is to work from a position of trying to understand each other and find ways through the complexity to something that works and delivers free, Open Access publishing.

The difference between books and journals

While journal authors transfer rights or retain copyright, books can have contracts that grant rights to the publisher in specific regions for a specific duration for sales of printed material for example. Whereas articles are shorter outputs, breaking the book into smaller pieces for sharing, i.e. chapters, is not always welcomed by some authors or disciplines.

Embargoes might also be less of an issue in HSS where there is less of an immediate need to get 'results' or research out immediately. Books also might also have a longer tail of usefulness than an article.

The time invested in the book output is generally higher for books. The brand of the article can also be stronger than that of the book, since it is often the author's name which carries more importance than that of the publisher.

A further complexity is that if funders fund different chapters of a book, they might have different licenses assigned to them.

Rights retention

Rights retention is really a cornerstone of genuine transition to Open Access. When polled at the meeting, 100% disagreed with the statement "Do you agree to transfer full copyright to the publisher? showing complete consensus here. This means authors taking control or taking back control of Intellectual Property.

While publishers don't need the copyright in order to publish, publishers seek some control, needing some rights in order to be able to publish work, and to be able to continue doing so. It can be difficult to come to an agreement with authors on this point. It was mentioned by more than one voice that transferring non-exclusive rights to publishers is sufficient.

When analysing a range of funder policies, very few funders currently mention rights retention in their policies, with only 2 cases stating that it was good for authors or institutions to retain copyright. They were encouraged rather than mandated to retain copyright.

As regards the current Plan S RRS for journals, someone expressed doubts about its relevance for books since, for example, the book chapter is more closely linked to a particular publisher than an article might be, and the scale is different. Furthermore, a question was raised as to whether a blanket policy for embargos and rights retention would work for the variety of book outputs.

Any rights retention policy goes hand-in-hand with a Green OA policy. As far as Green OA is concerned, having an openly licensed (CC BY) version available in Green OA that another publisher might then commercialise could be an issue for publishers in terms of undercutting their edition. In this case, NC-ND licenses might therefore be preferable.

One voice asked whether rights retention could be used as a revenue source, e.g. selling translation rights to an NC-ND licensed work. This might be a way to avoid BPCs.

Different types of CC licenses

The question is whether funders should restrict licence types or be more flexible in what type can be used. Currently some funders prefer CC BY over other licenses, while allowing some flexibility, whereas others do not specify any kind of license. What is key is that authors need to be able to easily comply with the requirement. Some felt that if funders pay for the OA work, they should decide on the license, which can be CC BY or CC BY ND in the case of NWO for example. Horizon Europe prefers CC BY but allows CC BY-NC/ND/NC-ND.

In the workshop poll, 37% agreed that **CC BY** should be mandated whereas 63% did not. While CC BY might open doors to commercial exploitation by some it allows for the maximum dissemination of the work so the benefits may outweigh the risks. Piracy can be found in many sectors.

While CC BY could be a requirement, some indicated that authors prefer NC-ND or ND in HSS. Whilst some publishers want to restrict access through certain types of open licensing, open licensing is about empowering authors: having control over how their work is used. Authors have strong relationships with their publishers, hence they need to be part of the conversation about open licensing.

With CC BY NC, the author could allow commercial use by certain publishers or organisations, as they chose. A possible danger with this is that the author may take advantage of this freedom. These rights could also be transferred to the publisher. NC can preclude authors from using their work on platforms where there is any commercial activity at all, e.g. educational platforms that use advertising. However, the author can grant permission to commercialise on request.

While some funders allow CC BY ND, some authors are very concerned about derivatives being made from their work. For example, some authors are concerned about their work being used out of context, repurposed, or misrepresented. However, this license does not allow translations of the work to be freely made. A question was raised about the dangers of poor translation, but is that worse than not having the book published in that language at all? There was consensus that we would prefer to avoid CC BY-ND. Some were of the opinion that CC BY NC/ND is not really Open Access whereas **CC BY SA** is. CC BY SA can prevent major misuses of OA although we have yet to understand the true consequences of SA.

The NC ND license could protect the publisher revenue model, e.g. by preventing the reselling of Open Access content in a bundle of subscriptions to paid services.

One attendee suggested that a Plan S for books should **allow all CC licences,** but find a rewarding system for more open publications.

Open licensing should also accommodate **data mining.**

Licensing could/should be **included in the metadata,** ideally in a machine readable format. There may be challenges with recording differently licenced third-party content through multiple DOI components. CrossRef has a [Books Interest Group](), [Metadata 2020 collecting]()use cases.

Author choice
It is frustrating for authors when they don't have full control over their rights. It is also confusing for authors that funders say that authors should retain rights, but also impose licensing requirements. Some felt that authors should have the choice as regards which open license their work is published under. This would help acceptance of the Plan S policy by HSS authors who feel that the policy is designed for STEM and imposed on them without taking into consideration differences in discipline. It is also important to consider balancing the interests of publishers and creators who may want others to reuse the material, e.g. the public.
Ideally, authors should be engaged in a knowledgeable discussion about how they want to license their work, on the understanding that it will be done in an open way.

Third-party material
Obtaining permission for third-party material is a digital rights question. For Green OA, for example, one might not be able to get third-party permissions to include content in a manuscript (licences to reproduce copyright material can often be very specific) or at least, the author would have to go about this differently to the way the publisher acquires rights to publish material for a closed-access book. This has particular implications for certain HSS disciplines, e.g. art history.

The role of publishers
Publishers have the responsibility to support authors in achieving widest dissemination. They should not overreach in order to maintain control of their commercial interests and should allow authors to re-use articles etc. Publishers need to rethink their role. Licences can be an over-correction of publishers who retain too much control over content rights.
There may be a difference between OA-born publishers and larger legacy or commercial publishers in relation to how they deal with rights retention, open licensing and the fear of commercial exploitation. The effort put into the publishing process may also vary.
Publisher prestige does not mix well with open licenses.

Unintended consequences
Funders need to be sensitive to the negative effects of strict requirements for licensing. An NC license prevents others from commercially exploiting open content, cannibalizing sales and confusing readers with multiple versions on Amazon, for example. While this happens, it is not frequent and is perhaps a consequence of using the CC BY licence. Open licensing without NC has the advantage of distributing the content more widely, including to new markets from which the publisher might benefit. The OA version might be inferior, since third-party material may need to be removed.

The importance of understanding copyright
There was broad consensus that authors, publishers, funders, institutions and libraries need to be aware of the legal aspects of OA books. More knowledge and education is needed on the implications of licensing, open licensing, the challenges posed by third-party rights or the understanding of what fair use is in a research or educational environment. We need resources to explain this coherently, e.g. the OAPEN OA Books Toolkit and the Creative Commons wiki are useful resources. Greater knowledge would also empower authors in negotiations with publishers.